

3. Claims 10-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by GB Pat. No. 2,307,113 to Duff (hereinafter "Duff").

Claim 10 recites a plug connector having:

"...a spring loaded slider shell that in spaced relationship coaxially surrounds said pin projecting portion, wherein said slider shell axially slides upward when said plug connector is inserted into the socket connector to expose said pin projecting portion to axially beyond the upwardly slid said spring loaded slider shell."(emphasis added, cl. 10)

As recited in claim 10, the slider shell is spring loaded. The Official Action contends that Duff teaches "*a spring loaded slider shell (58)...*" (see Official Action, pg. 4). However, element 58 in Duff is a metallic housing (see pg. 6, lines 10-13 in Duff). Specifically, a fair and proper reading of Duff indicates that the metallic housing 58 is not a spring loaded slider shell that axially slides upward when the plug connector is inserted into the socket connector. The metallic housing 58 of Duff is shaped to conform to the conical projection 48 which conical projection fixedly secures the contact 50. (see Duff, pg. 6, lines 10-13, Fig. 1 and Fig. 3). The metallic housing 58 of Duff functions as a receptacle for the conical projection that forms an immobile part of the second connector 42 as the contact 50 is inserted into the aperture 26. (see Duff, Figs. 1 and 3)

A 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection requires that a single reference teach each and every element of the claimed invention. However, Duff fails to disclose a spring loaded slider shell, and more specifically a spring loaded slider shell that axially slides upward when the plug connector is inserted into the socket connector as recited in claim 10. Hence, Duff is incapable of anticipating claim 10 and claims 11-14 dependent thereon.

5. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious in view of Chang and Duff.

For the reasons set forth above, Chang is not prior art to the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that obviousness rejection of claim 15 has been obviated.

6. The undersigned representative notes the additional prior art references cited but not applied, and agrees that the references neither anticipate or render obvious (either alone or in combination) the claimed invention.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

*Patrick O'Shea*

---

Patrick J. O'Shea  
Registration No. 35,305  
Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens, LLP  
225 Franklin Street, Suite 3300  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
Telephone: (617) 426-9180  
Extension 121